REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 14, 16-18, and 20-27 are pending.

Claims 1-3, 7-11, and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) in view of Flurry (US 5,455,958 A).

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Puar (US 5,703,806 A).

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Kohli (US 6,252,600 B1).

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Rogers (US 4,530,047 A).

Claims 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Mills (US 6,311,204 B1).

Claims 17, 18, 20-23, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) in view of Dye (US 6,002,411 A).

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Dye (US 6,002,411 A).

Changes in the Claims:

Claims 1, 17, 21, 24, 25 have been amended in this application to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. No new matter has been added.

Support for the amendments may be found in the present specification at paragraph [0014]: "two independent images may be displayed on the same display device or the two independent images may each be displayed on separate display devices."

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claims 1-3, 7-11, and 24

Claims 1-3, 7-11, and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) in view of Flurry (US 5,455,958 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Under MPEP §706.02(j), in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness required for a §103 rejection, three basic criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the reference or combine reference teachings (MPEP §2143.01), (2) a reasonable expectation of success (MPEP §2143.02), and (3) the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP §2143.03). See In re Royka, 490 F. 2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Johns describes an asynchronous context switching mechanism of a graphics adapter 208 connected to a display device 210. Requests of graphics processes are received to process graphics data for display in a queue in the graphics adapter. Johns, Abstract and FIGS. 2 and 3.

Flurry describes a graphics-rendering engine that allows for multiple display devices to be connected to. Flurry, Col. 5, lines 25-30. The graphics-rendering engine (RCM 22) permits a single application program to access a single display device at a given instant, while making it appear to an X Server that multiple applications are accessing the display device simultaneously. Flurry, Col. 4, lines 54-59. A graphics-rendering engine tricks the X Server into thinking that multiple applications are simultaneously accessing a single display device. The exact same image is displayed on the first display device and the second display device.

Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combined teachings of Johns and Flurry does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations recited in Claims 1-3, 7-11, and 24. In particular, neither Johns nor Flurry teach or suggest **a first independent image displayed on a first display device, and a second independent image displayed on a second display device**. Johns is completely silent on this limitation. Flurry only suggest multiple display devices displaying the same image and not different images.

Applicant therefore submits that claims 1-3, 7-11, and 24 recite novel subject matter which distinguishes over any possible combination of Johns and Flurry.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claim 4

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Puar (US 5,703,806 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reason that each of the rejected claims ultimately depend on an above-discussed base claim. The arguments set forth above regarding the base claims are equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claims 5 and 6

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Kohli (US 6,252,600 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reason that each of the rejected claims ultimately depend on an above-discussed base claim. The arguments set forth above regarding the base claims are equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claim 12

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Rogers (US 4,530,047 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reason that each of the rejected claims ultimately depend on an above-discussed base claim. The arguments set forth above regarding the base claims are equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claims 14 and 16

Claims 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Mills (US 6,311,204 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reason that each of the rejected claims ultimately depend on an above-discussed base claim. The arguments set forth above regarding the base claims are equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claims 17, 18, 20-23, 25, and 26

Claims 17, 18, 20-23, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) in view of Dye (US 6,002,411 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combined teachings of Johns and Flurry does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations recited in Claims 17, 18, 20-23, 25, and 26. In particular, neither Johns nor Dye teach or suggest **a first independent image displayed on a first display device, and a second independent image displayed on a second display device**. Johns and Dye are completely silent on this limitation.

Applicant therefore submits that claims 17, 18, 20-23, 25, and 26 recite novel subject matter which distinguishes over any possible combination of Johns and Dye.

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) – claim 27

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Johns (US 6,674,841 B1) and Flurry (US 5,455,958 A) in view of Dye (US 6,002,411 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reason that each of the rejected claims ultimately depend on an above-discussed base claim. The arguments set forth above regarding the base claims are equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that the amended claims are now in proper form, and that the amended claims all define patentable subject matter over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Request for allowance

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

Invitation for Interview

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 6/23/2006

Thierry K. Lo
Reg. No. 49,097

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300